



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Bruce W. McClendon FAICP
Director of Planning

September 13, 2007

TO: Librarian
Baldwin Park Library
4181 Baldwin Park Blvd
Baldwin Park, CA 91706

FROM: Josh Huntington, AICP *4511*
Regional Planning Assistant II
Department of Regional Planning
Land Divisions Section
320 West Temple Street, Room 1382
Los Angeles, California 90012

**SUBJECT: TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 064246
227 S. Orange Blossom Avenue, Avocado Heights**

The subject project is scheduled for a Public Hearing before the Hearing Officer of Los Angeles County on October 16, 2007.

Please have the materials listed below available to the public through October 26, 2007.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Josh Huntington from the Land Divisions Section of the Department of Regional Planning at (213) 974-6433.

Thank you.

- Attachments:
1. Copy of Tentative Tract Map No. 064246 dated January 23, 2006.
 2. Land Use Map
 3. Notice of Public Hearing and Vicinity Map
 4. Draft Factual
 5. Draft Conditions
 6. Negative Declaration



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING FOR
PROPOSED LAND DIVISION
NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Bruce W. McClendon FAICP
Director of Planning

TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 064246

Notice is hereby given that a Hearing Officer of Los Angeles County will conduct a public hearing concerning this proposed land development on Tuesday, October 16, 2007, at 9:00AM, in Room 150, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The doors will open at 8:50AM. Interested persons will be given an opportunity to testify.

A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. The draft environmental document concludes that the project design will have no significant environmental impact. Notice is hereby given that the County of Los Angeles will consider a recommendation to adopt a Negative Declaration.

Project description: The Tract Map proposes to create five (5) single-family lots on a .88 gross acre property. The rectangular-shaped subject property currently contains a single family home that will be removed.

Project location: The property is located at 227 S. Orange Blossom Ave. – on the northwest side of the street, approximately 750 ft southwest of E. Valley Blvd. The property is located within the unincorporated community of Avocado Heights and is in the Puente Zoned District of Los Angeles County.

This project does not affect the zoning of surrounding properties. If you are unable to attend the public hearing but wish to send written comments, please write to the Department of Regional Planning at the address given below, Attention: Josh Huntington. You may also obtain additional information concerning this case by phoning Josh Huntington at (213) 974-6433. Callers from North County areas may dial (661) 272-0964 (Antelope Valley) or (661) 253-0111 (Santa Clarita) and then ask to be connected to (213) 974-6433. Public service hours: 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday. Our office is closed on Fridays.


If the final decision on this proposal is challenged in court, testimony may be limited to issues raised at the public hearing or by written correspondence delivered to the Hearing Officer at or prior to the public hearing.

Case materials are available for inspection during regular working hours at the Department of Regional Planning, Land Divisions Section, Room 1382, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012; Telephone (213) 974-6433. Public service hours: 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday. **Our office is closed on Fridays.** These materials will also be available for review beginning September 16, 2007 at the Baldwin Park Library located at 4181 Baldwin Park Blvd, Baldwin Park, CA 91706. Selected materials are also available on the Department of Regional Planning website at <http://planning.lacounty.gov>.

BRUCE W. MCCLENDON, FAICP
Planning Director

"ADA ACCOMMODATIONS: If you require reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids and services such as material in alternate format or a sign language interpreter, please contact the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Coordinator at (213) 974-6488 (Voice) or (213) 617-2292 (TDD), with at least three business days notice".

"Este es un aviso de una audiencia publica de acuerdo al Decreto de la Protección del Medio Ambiente de California. El proyecto que se considerará por el Condado de Los Angeles es una propuesta para crear 5 lotes de familia singular en 0.88 acres total. La audiencia publica para considerar el proyecto se llevará acabo el 16 de octubre de 2007. Si necesita mas información, o si quiere este aviso en Español, favor llamar al Departamento de Planificación al (213) 974-6466."





Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone (213) 974-6433

TRACT MAP NO. 064246 – (1)

RPC/HO MEETING DATE CONTINUE TO

AGENDA ITEM

PUBLIC HEARING DATE
October 16, 2007

APPLICANT Kimberly Dolfi		OWNER Claire Cappadona		REPRESENTATIVE Ryan Walker, P.E.	
REQUEST Tentative Parcel Map: To create five (5) single family lots on a 0.88 gross acre property.					
LOCATION/ADDRESS 227 S. Orange Blossom Ave., Avocado Heights [APN: 8112-002-004]			ZONED DISTRICT Puente		
			COMMUNITY Avocado Heights		
ACCESS Arroyo Drive			EXISTING ZONING A-1-6,000 (Light Agriculture – 6,000 square feet min. required lot area)		
SIZE 0.88 gross acres		EXISTING LAND USE Single Family House		SHAPE Rectangular	
				TOPOGRAPHY Flat	
SURROUNDING LAND USES & ZONING					
North: Single Family Residential / A-1-6,000 (Light Agriculture – 6,000 square feet min. required lot area)			East: Single Family Residential / A-1-6,000 (Light Agriculture – 6,000 square feet min. required lot area)		
South: Single Family Residential / A-1-6,000 (Light Agriculture – 6,000 square feet min. required lot area)			West: Single Family Residential / A-1-6,000 (Light Agriculture – 6,000 square feet min. required lot area)		
GENERAL PLAN	DESIGNATION	MAXIMUM DENSITY	CONSISTENCY		
Los Angeles County General Plan	1 (Low Density Residential)	5 Dwelling Units	Yes		
ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS A Negative Declaration has been recommended for this project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the Los Angeles County Environmental Guidelines. Based on the initial study, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.					
DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN The tentative tract map dated December 23, 2006, depicts a subdivision consisting of five (5) single family lots on a 0.68 gross acre property. The subject property currently contains a single family house that will be removed. The proposed development will be accessed from S. Orange Blossom Avenue via a 30-foot wide private driveway and fire lane extending along the southwest side of the subdivision. No grading is proposed for the project.					
KEY ISSUES <ul style="list-style-type: none">The subject property is located within the Avocado Heights Community Standards District ("CSD"). The proposed development conforms to all of the requirements of the CSD. <p style="text-align: right;">(If more space is required, use opposite side)</p>					

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY ON CASES TO BE HEARD BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFF CONTACT PERSON		
RPC HEARING DATE (S)	RPC ACTION DATE	RPC RECOMMENDATION
MEMBERS VOTING AYE	MEMBERS VOTING NO	MEMBERS ABSTAINING
STAFF RECOMMENDATION (PRIOR TO HEARING)		
SPEAKERS*	PETITIONS	LETTERS
(O) (F)	(O) (F)	(O) (F)

*(O) = Opponents (F) = In Favor

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (Subject to revision based on public hearing)

- ☒ APPROVAL
- ☐ DENIAL
- ☐ No improvements
- ☐ 20 Acre Lots
- ☐ 10 Acre Lots
- ☐ 2½ Acre Lots
- ☐ Sect 191.2
- ☒ Street improvements
- ☐ Paving
- ☒ Curbs and Gutters
- ☒ Street Lights
- ☒ Street Trees
- ☐ Inverted Shoulder
- ☒ Sidewalks
- ☐ Off Site Paving
- ☐ ft.
- ☐ Water Mains and Hydrants
- ☐ Drainage Facilities
- ☒ Sewer
- ☐ Septic Tanks
- ☒ Other
- Sidewalks to meet ADA standards.
- ☒ Park Dedication "In-Lieu Fee"

SPECIAL INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENT CONCERNS

ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

**DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 064246**

Map Date: January 23, 2006

DRAFT CONDITIONS:

1. Conform to the requirements of Title 21 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"), the requirements of the A-1-6,000 zone, and the Avocado Heights Community Standards District.
2. Label the driveway as "Private Driveway and Fire Lane" on the final map.
3. Submit a copy of the project Maintenance Agreement for the Private Driveway and Fire Lane to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") for review and approval.
4. Post the common driveway as "No Parking" and provide for its continued enforcement in the Maintenance Agreement. Submit a copy of this document to be recorded to Regional Planning prior to final map approval.
5. Provide in the Maintenance Agreement a method for the continual maintenance of the common areas, including the driveways and the lighting system to the satisfaction of Regional Planning.
6. Dedicate the right to restrict vehicular access along the property frontage on Orange Blossom Avenue.
7. In accordance with Section 21.32.195 of the County Code, the Subdivider or successor in interest shall plant or cause to be planted at least one tree of a non-invasive species within the front yard of each residential lot. The location and the species of said trees shall be incorporated into a site plan or landscape plan. Prior to final map approval, the site/landscaping plan shall be approved by Regional Planning, and a bond shall be posted with Public Works or other verification shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Regional Planning to ensure the planting of the required trees.
8. Pay the Fish and Game Fee of \$1,850.00 prior to final map recordation.
9. The Subdivider shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County of Los Angeles ("County"), its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, and employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this parcel map approval, or related discretionary approvals, whether legislative or quasi-judicial, which action is brought within the applicable time period of the Government Code Section 65499.37 or any other applicable time period. The County shall promptly notify the Subdivider of any claim, action or proceeding and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly to notify the

Subdivider of any claim, action or proceeding, or the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the Subdivider shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.

10. In the event that any claim, action or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the Subdivider shall within ten days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000.00 from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expense involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to the Subdivider, or the Subdivider's counsel. The Subdivider shall pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
 - a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the deposit amount, the Subdivider shall deposit additional funds to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to the completion of the litigation.
 - b. At the sole discretion of the Subdivider, the amount of the initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the Subdivider according to the County Code Section 2.170.010.

Except as modified herein above, this approval is subject to all the conditions set forth in the attached reports recommended by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION – SUBDIVISION
TRACT NO. 064246 (Rev.)

Page 1/2

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 01-23-2006

The following reports consisting of 9 pages are the recommendations of Public Works.

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Details and notes shown on the tentative map are not necessarily approved. Any details or notes which may be inconsistent with requirements of ordinances, general conditions of approval, or Department policies must be specifically approved in other conditions, or ordinance requirements are modified to those shown on the tentative map upon approval by the Advisory agency.
2. Easements are tentatively required, subject to review by the Director of Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.
3. Easements shall not be granted or recorded within areas proposed to be granted, dedicated, or offered for dedication for public streets, highways, access rights, building restriction rights, or other easements until after the final map is filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office. If easements are granted after the date of tentative approval, a subordination must be executed by the easement holder prior to the filing of the final map.
4. In lieu of establishing the final specific locations of structures on each lot/parcel at this time, the owner, at the time of issuance of a grading or building permit, agrees to develop the property in conformance with the County Code and other appropriate ordinances such as the Building Code, Plumbing Code, Grading Ordinance, Highway Permit Ordinance, Mechanical Code, Zoning Ordinance, Undergrounding of Utilities Ordinance, Water Ordinance, Sanitary Sewer and Industrial Waste Ordinance, Electrical Code, and Fire Code. Improvements and other requirements may be imposed pursuant to such codes and ordinances.
5. All easements existing at the time of final map approval must be accounted for on the approved tentative map. This includes the location, owner, purpose, and recording reference for all existing easements. If an easement is blanket or indeterminate in nature, a statement to that effect must be shown on the tentative map in lieu of its location. If all easements have not been accounted for, submit a corrected tentative map to the Department of Regional Planning for approval.
6. Adjust, relocate, and/or eliminate lot lines, lots, streets, easements, grading, geotechnical protective devices, and/or physical improvements to comply with ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the date the County determined the application to be complete all to the satisfaction of Public Works.
7. Quitclaim or relocate easements running through proposed structures.

8. Label driveways and multiple access strips as "Private Driveway and Fire Lane" and delineate on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.
9. Reserve reciprocal easements for drainage, ingress/egress, sewer, water, utilities, and maintenance purposes, etc., in documents over the common private driveways to the satisfaction of Public Works.
10. Remove existing buildings prior to final map approval. Demolition permits are required from the Building and Safety office.
11. A final tract map must be processed through the Director of Public Works prior to being filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.
12. Prior to submitting the tract map to the Director of Public Works for examination pursuant to Section 66442 of the Government Code, obtain clearances from all affected Departments and Divisions, including a clearance from the Subdivision Mapping Section of the Land Development Division of Public Works for the following mapping items; mathematical accuracy; survey analysis; and correctness of certificates, signatures, etc.
13. A final guarantee will be required at the time of filing of the final map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.
14. Within 30 days of the approval date of this land use entitlement or at the time of first plan check submittal, the applicant shall deposit the sum of \$2,000 (Minor Land Divisions) or \$5,000 (Major Land Divisions) with Public Works to defray the cost of verifying conditions of approval for the purpose of issuing final map clearances. This deposit will cover the actual cost of reviewing conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permits, Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Vesting Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Oak Tree Permits, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, CEQA Mitigation Monitoring Programs and Regulatory Permits from State and Federal Agencies (Fish and Game, USF&W, Army Corps, RWQCB, etc.) as they relate to the various plan check activities and improvement plan designs. In addition, this deposit will be used to conduct site field reviews and attend meetings requested by the applicant and/or his agents for the purpose of resolving technical issues on condition compliance as they relate to improvement plan design, engineering studies, highway alignment studies and tract/parcel map boundary, title and easement issues. When 80% of the deposit is expended, the applicant will be required to provide additional funds to restore the initial deposit. Remaining balances in the deposit account will be refunded upon final map recordation.



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
SUBDIVISION PLAN CHECKING SECTION
DRAINAGE AND GRADING UNIT

TRACT NO. 064246

REV TENTATIVE MAP DATED 01/23/06


DRAINAGE CONDITIONS

Approval of this map pertaining to drainage is recommended.

=====

GRADING CONDITIONS:

Provide a Deed Restriction draft to account for cross lot drainage (do not notarize and record document until instructed to do so). This is required prior to recordation of the final map.

Name  Date 03/02/06 Phone (626) 458-4921
GARY GUO

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 01-23-06
LOCATION La Puente

REPORT DATE -----
REPORT DATE 04-20-06

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
GEOTECHNICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING DIVISION

SOILS ENGINEERING REVIEW SHEET

Address: 900 S. Fremont Ave., Alhambra, CA 91803
Telephone: (626) 458-4925
Fax: (626) 458-4913

District Office 2.0
PCA GMTR
Sheet 1 of 1

Ungraded Site Lots

Tentative Tract Map 64246
Location Orange Blossom Avenue, La Puente
Developer/Owner Cappadona
Engineer/Architect GRW & Son, Inc.
Soils Engineer Geo-Etka, Inc. (F-10628-06)
Geologist ---

DISTRIBUTION:

☐ Drainage
☐ Grading
☐ Geo/Soils Central File
☐ District Engineer
☐ Geologist
☐ Soils Engineer
☐ Engineer/Architect

Review of:

Revised Tentative Tract Map Dated by Regional Planning 1/23/06
Soils Engineering Report Dated 4/20/06
Soils Engineering Report Dated 4/20/06 (on Compact Disk)
Previous Review Sheet Dated 5/30/06

ACTION:


Tentative Map feasibility is recommended for approval.

NOTE(S) TO THE PLAN CHECKER/BUILDING AND SAFETY ENGINEER:

ON-SITE SOILS ARE MODERATELY CORROSIVE TO FERROUS METALS.

Prepared by

Brian D. Smith



Date 8/3/06

NOTICE: Public safety, relative to geotechnical subsurface exploration, shall be provided in accordance with current codes for excavations, inclusive of the Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 11.48, and the State of California, Title 8, Construction Safety Orders.

P:\gmepub\Soils Review\Smith\TR 64246, Orange Blossom Avenue, La Puente, TTM-A_3.doc

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Close any unused driveway with standard curb and gutter along the property frontage on Orange Blossom Avenue.
2. Repair any broken or damaged curb, gutter, driveway apron, and pavement along the property frontage on Orange Blossom Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.
3. Construct sidewalk along the property frontage on Orange Blossom Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Public Works has no objection if sidewalk is waived along the property frontage on Orange Blossom Avenue. Sidewalks will not be in keeping with the neighborhood pattern.
4. Plant street trees along the property frontage on Orange Blossom Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Existing trees in dedicated right of way shall be removed and replaced if not acceptable as street trees.
5. Comply with the following street lighting requirements:
 - a. Provide street lights on concrete poles with underground wiring along the property frontage on Orange Blossom Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Submit street lighting plans as soon as possible for review and approval to the Street Lighting Section of the Traffic and Lighting Division. For additional information, please contact the Street Lighting Section at (626) 300-4726.
 - b. The proposed development is within an existing Lighting District. For acceptance of street light transfer of billing, all street lights in the development, or the current phase of the development, must be constructed according to Public Works approved plans. The contractor shall submit one complete set of "as-built" plans. Provided the above conditions are met, all street lights in the development, or the current phase of the development, have been energized, and the developer has requested a transfer of billing at least by January 1 of the previous year, the Lighting District can assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the street lights by July 1 of any given year.
6. Underground all existing service lines and distribution lines that are less than 50 KV and new utility lines to the satisfaction of Public Works and Southern California Edison. Please contact Construction Division at (626) 458-3129 for new location of any above ground utility structure in the parkway.

7. Install postal delivery receptacles in groups to serve two or more residential lots.
8. Prior to final map approval, enter into an agreement with the County franchised cable TV operator (if an area is served) to permit the installation of cable in a common utility trench to the satisfaction of Public Works; or provide documentation that steps to provide cable TV to the proposed subdivision have been initiated to the satisfaction of Public Works.

HW
Prepared by Theresa J. Nolin
tr64246r-rev1.doc

Phone (626) 458-4915

Date 03-13-2006

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. The subdivider shall install separate house laterals to the existing sewer main line in Orange Blossom Avenue to serve each lot in the land division.
2. A sewer area study for the proposed subdivision (PC11954AS, dated 2-22-2007) was reviewed and approved. No additional mitigation measures are required. The approved sewer area study shall remain valid for two years after initial approval of the tentative map. After this period of time, an update of the area study shall be submitted by the applicant if determined to be warranted by Public Works.
3. Obtain a will serve letter from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District for the discharge of sewer into the sewers trunk line.

HW
Prepared by Imelda Ng
tr64246-rev1(rev'd 03-28-07).doc

Phone (626) 458-4921

Date 03-28-2007

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. A water system maintained by the water purveyor, with appurtenant facilities to serve all lots in the land division, must be provided. The system shall include fire hydrants of the type and location (both on-site and off-site) as determined by the Fire Department. The water mains shall be sized to accommodate the total domestic and fire flows.
2. There shall be filed with Public Works a statement from the water purveyor indicating that the water system will be operated by the purveyor, and that under normal conditions, the system will meet the requirements for the land division, and that water service will be provided to each lot.

HW

Prepared by Massie Munroe
tr64246w-rev.1doc

Phone (626) 458-3836

Date 03-01-2006



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

RP
Reamon

WATER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision No. TR064246 Tentative Map Date 23-January-06

Revised Report yes

- ☐ The County Forester and Fire Warden is prohibited from setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted. However, water requirements may be necessary at the time of building permit issuance.
- ☒ The required fire flow for public fire hydrants at this location is 1250 gallons per minute at 20 psi for a duration of 2 hours, over and above maximum daily domestic demand. 1 Hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously may be used to achieve the required fire flow.
- ☐ The required fire flow for private on-site hydrants is gallons per minute at 20 psi. Each private on-site hydrant must be capable of flowing gallons per minute at 20 psi with two hydrants flowing simultaneously, one of which must be the furthest from the public water source.
- ☒ Fire hydrant requirements are as follows:
- Install public fire hydrant(s). Verify / Upgrade existing 1 public fire hydrant(s).
- Install private on-site fire hydrant(s).
- ☒ All hydrants shall measure 6"x 4"x 2-1/2" brass or bronze, conforming to current AWWA standard C503 or approved equal. All on-site hydrants shall be installed a minimum of 25' feet from a structure or protected by a two (2) hour rated firewall.
- ☒ Location: As per map on file with the office.
- ☒ Other location: Existing fire hydrant located 221' northeast of property line.
- ☐ All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted or bonded for prior to Final Map approval. Vehicular access shall be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction.
- ☐ The County of Los Angeles Fire Department is not setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted.
- ☒ Additional water system requirements will be required when this land is further subdivided and/or during the building permit process.
- ☐ Hydrants and fire flows are adequate to meet current Fire Department requirements.
- ☒ Upgrade not necessary, if existing hydrant(s) meet(s) fire flow requirements. Submit original water availability form to our office.

Comments: Verification of fire flow shall be submitted prior to the clearance of the Tentative Map.

All hydrants shall be installed in conformance with Title 20, County of Los Angeles Government Code and County of Los Angeles Fire Code, or appropriate city regulations. This shall include minimum six-inch diameter mains. Arrangements to meet these requirements must be made with the water purveyor serving the area.

By Inspector Juan C. Padilla Date March 9, 2006



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBDIVISION - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision: TR064246 Map Date 23-January-06

C.U.P. _____ Vicinity Map 0303A

- ☐ **FIRE DEPARTMENT HOLD** on the tentative map shall remain until verification from the Los Angeles County Fire Dept. Planning Section is received, stating adequacy of service. Contact (323) 881-2404.
- ☒ Access shall comply with Title 21 (County of Los Angeles Subdivision Code) and Section 902 of the Fire Code, which requires all weather access. All weather access may require paving.
- ☒ Fire Department access shall be extended to within 150 feet distance of any exterior portion of all structures.
- ☒ Where driveways extend further than 150 feet and are of single access design, turnarounds suitable for fire protection equipment use shall be provided and shown on the final map. Turnarounds shall be designed, constructed and maintained to insure their integrity for Fire Department use. Where topography dictates, turnarounds shall be provided for driveways that extend over 150 feet in length.
- ☒ The private driveways shall be indicated on the final map as "Private Driveway and Firelane" with the widths clearly depicted. Driveways shall be maintained in accordance with the Fire Code.
- ☐ Vehicular access must be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction to all required fire hydrants. All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted prior to construction.
- ☐ This property is located within the area described by the Fire Department as "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" (formerly Fire Zone 4). A "Fuel Modification Plan" shall be submitted and approved prior to final map clearance. (Contact: Fuel Modification Unit, Fire Station #32, 605 North Angeleno Avenue, Azusa, CA 91702-2904, Phone (626) 969-5205 for details).
- ☒ Provide Fire Department or City approved street signs and building access numbers prior to occupancy.
- ☐ Additional fire protection systems shall be installed in lieu of suitable access and/or fire protection water.
- ☐ The final concept map, which has been submitted to this department for review, has fulfilled the conditions of approval recommended by this department for access only.
- ☐ These conditions must be secured by a C.U.P. and/or Covenant and Agreement approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department prior to final map clearance.
- ☐ The Fire Department has no additional requirements for this division of land.

Comments: **The proposed driveway shall provide the following paved widths: From Orange Blossom to the lot line between lots 3-4 shall be 24', adjacent to lot 4 shall provide 20' minimum pavement, lot 5 shall provide 15' pavement to within 150' of all exterior walls.**

By Inspector: Juan C. Padilla Date March 9, 2006

Land Development Unit – Fire Prevention Division – (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783



LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION



PARK OBLIGATION REPORT

Tentative Map # 64246

DRP Map Date: 01/23/2006

SCM Date: / /

Report Date: 03/09/2006

Park Planning Area # 7

AVOCADO HEIGHTS / WEST PUENTE VALLEY

Map Type: REV. (REV RECD)

Total Units = Proposed Units + Exempt Units

Sections 21.24.340, 21.24.350, 21.28.120, 21.28.130, and 21.28.140, the County of Los Angeles Code, Title 21, Subdivision Ordinance provide that the County will determine whether the development's park obligation is to be met by:

- 1) the dedication of land for public or private park purpose or,
- 2) the payment of in-lieu fees or,
- 3) the provision of amenities or any combination of the above.

The specific determination of how the park obligation will be satisfied will be based on the conditions of approval by the advisory agency as recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

Park land obligation in acres or in-lieu fees:

ACRES:	0.05
IN-LIEU FEES:	\$10,319

Conditions of the map approval:

The park obligation for this development will be met by:

The payment of \$10,319 in-lieu fees.

Trails:

No trails.


Comments:

5 single family lots, with credit for 1 existing house to be removed, net density increase of 4 units.

Contact Patrocenia T. Sobrepeña, Departmental Facilities Planner I, Department of Parks and Recreation, 510 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, California, 90020 at (213) 351-5120 for further information or an appointment to make an in-lieu fee payment.

For information on Hiking and Equestrian Trail requirements contact Trail Coordinator at (213) 351-5135.

By:


James Barber, Advanced Planning Section Head

Supv D 1st
March 07, 2006 16:12:26
QMB02F.FRX



LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION



PARK OBLIGATION WORKSHEET

Tentative Map # **64246**

DRP Map Date: **01/23/2006**

SMC Date: / /

Report Date: **03/09/2006**

Park Planning Area # **7**

AVOCADO HEIGHTS / WEST PUENTE VALLEY

Map Type: **REV. (REV RECD)**

The formula for calculating the acreage obligation and or In-lieu fee is as follows:

$$(P) \text{ people} \times (0.003) \text{ Goal} \times (U) \text{ nits} = (X) \text{ acres obligation}$$

$$(X) \text{ acres obligation} \times \text{RLV/Acre} = \text{In-Lieu Base Fee}$$

Where: P = Estimate of number of People per dwelling unit according to the type of dwelling unit as determined by the 2000 U.S. Census*. Assume * people for detached single-family residences; Assume * people for attached single-family (townhouse) residences, two-family residences, and apartment houses containing fewer than five dwelling units; Assume * people for apartment houses containing five or more dwelling units; Assume * people for mobile homes.

Goal = The subdivision ordinance allows for the goal of 3.0 acres of park land for each 1,000 people generated by the development. This goal is calculated as "0.0030" in the formula.

U = Total approved number of Dwelling Units.

X = Local park space obligation expressed in terms of acres.

RLV/Acre = Representative Land Value per Acre by Park Planning Area.

Total Units **5** = Proposed Units **4** + Exempt Units **1**

	People*	Goal 3.0 Acres / 1000 People	Number of Units	Acre Obligation
Detached S.F. Units	4.53	0.0030	4	0.05
M.F. < 5 Units	4.60	0.0030	0	0.00
M.F. >= 5 Units	2.71	0.0030	0	0.00
Mobile Units	3.18	0.0030	0	0.00
Exempt Units			1	
Total Acre Obligation =				0.05

Park Planning Area = **7 AVOCADO HEIGHTS / WEST PUENTE VALLEY**

Goal	Acre Obligation	RLV / Acre	In-Lieu Base Fee
@(0.0030)	0.05	\$206,376	\$10,319

Lot #	Provided Space	Provided Acres	Credit (%)	Acre Credit	Land
None					
Total Provided Acre Credit:				0.00	

Acre Obligation	Public Land Crdt.	Priv. Land Crdt.	Net Obligation	RLV / Acre	In-Lieu Fee Due
0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	\$206,376	\$10,319



BRUCE A. CHERNOF, M.D.
Acting Director and Chief Medical Officer

FRED LEAF
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

JONATHAN E. FIELDING, M.D., M.P.H.
Director of Public Health and Health Officer

Environmental Health
ARTURO AGUIRRE, Director

Bureau of Environmental Protection
Mountain & Rural/Water, Sewage & Subdivision Program
5050 Commerce Drive, Baldwin Park, CA 91706-1423
TEL (626)430-5380 · FAX (626)813-3016
www.lapublichealth.org/eh/progs/envirp.htm



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Gloria Molina
First District

Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Second District

Zev Yaroslavsky
Third District

Don Knabe
Fourth District

Michael D. Antonovich
Fifth District

March 9, 2006

RFS No.06-0002966

Tract Map No. 064246

Vicinity: La Puente

Tentative Tract Map Date: January 23, 2006 (1st Revision)

The Los Angeles County Department of Health Services' conditions of approval for **Tentative Tract Map 064246** are unchanged by the submission of the revised map. The following conditions apply and are in force:

1. Potable water will be supplied by the **San Gabriel Valley Water Company**, a public water system, which guarantees water connection and service to all lots. The "will serve" letter from the indicated water company has been received by the Department.
2. Sewage disposal will be provided through the public sewer and wastewater treatment facilities of the **Los Angeles County Sanitation District #15** as proposed.
3. Existing septic systems shall be emptied of effluent and removed or filled with approved materials.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (626) 430-5380.

Respectfully,

Becky Valent, E.H.S. IV
Mountain and Rural/Water, Sewage, and Subdivision Program



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Bruce W. McClendon FAICP
Director of Planning

October 25, 2006

Kimberly Dolfi
302 North First St.
Covina, CA 91723

SUBJECT: INITIAL STUDY DETERMINATION LETTER
PROJECT: TR064246/RENV200500173


On October 25, 2006, the staff of the Department of Regional Planning completed its review of the Environmental Questionnaire and other data regarding your project and made the following determination as to the type of environmental document required.

Negative Declaration

If you have any questions regarding the above determination or environmental document preparation, please contact Dean Edwards of the Impact Analysis Section at (213) 974-6461, Monday to Thursday between 7:30 a.m. and 6 p.m. Our offices are closed on Fridays.

Very truly yours,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
James E. Hartl, AICP
Acting Director of Planning


Daryl Kouthnik, Supervising Regional Planner
Impact Analysis Section

JEH:DLK:de

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: TR064246

CASES: RENV200500173



****** INITIAL STUDY ******

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: 8/19/2005

Staff Member: Dean Edwards

Thomas Guide: 637 H4

USGS Quad: Baldwin Park

Location: 227 South Orange Blossom Avenue, La Puente

Description of Project: The proposed project is a request for a Tentative Tract Map to allow the creation of five (5) single-family residential lots ranging in size from .14 to .23 acres. Orange Blossom Avenue will provide ingress and egress access to Lots 1 and 2. A proposed shared private driveway will provide ingress and egress access to Lots 3, 4 and 5, each with a 10 foot wide easement, from Orange Blossom Avenue. No more than 500 cubic feet or grading is anticipated and will be balanced on the site. The existing residence located on proposed Lots 1 & 2 and on the proposed driveway, will be demolished.

Gross Area: Approximately .88 acre

Environmental Setting: The project site is located southeast of the San Gabriel Freeway (605), southwest of East Valley Boulevard, northwest of Workman Hill Road in the Avocado Heights community. The site is surrounded by single family residences. Commercial uses are located to the north along East Valley Boulevard and Ethel D. Keenan Elementary School is located to the south. A 16 foot wide storm drain easement crosses proposed Lots 4 & 5 and a 12 foot wide storm drain easement parallels the northeast property boundary. There are four trees located on the site, including 2 sycamore trees and an olive tree, that will be removed.

Zoning: A-1-6000

General Plan: 1: Low Density Residential

Community/Area Wide Plan: Avocado Heights CSD

Major projects in area:

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Description & Status</u>
<u>90271/TR49459</u>	<u>5 single-family residential units on .948 acres; Approved</u>
<u>89368/CP89368</u>	<u>Conditional Use Permit for a cabaret and signs; Approved</u>
<u>95025/TR51988, ZC95025</u>	<u>12 single-family lots and 5 commercial lots on 2.94 acres; Recorded</u>
<u>86076/CP86076</u>	<u>36 room motel on .41 acre lot; Denied</u>
<u>97060/CP97060, ZC97060</u>	<u>Materials recovery facility; Approved</u>
<u>TR062621</u>	<u>109 detached condominiums on 17.35 acres; Pending</u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ Regional Water Quality Control Board
- ☐ Los Angeles Region
- ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☐ _____

Trustee Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ State Fish and Game
- ☐ State Parks
- ☐ USFS _____

☐ _____

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.
- ☒ City of Industry _____
- ☒ City of La Puente _____
- ☒ Bassett Unified School District _____
- ☐ _____
- ☐ _____
- ☐ _____

☐ _____

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns Area
- ☐ _____

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ Subdivision Committee
- ☐ DPW: _____
- ☐ Health Services: _____
- ☐ _____
- ☐ _____

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			Potential Concern
			Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		Potentially Significant Impact	
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>The project site is located in a liquefaction zone.</i>
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Mandatory Findings	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS) *

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: 1 Revitalization

2. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?

3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- ☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- ☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Dean Edwards

Date: 21 SEPTEMBER 2006

Approved by: Daryl Hartink

Date: 21 SEPTEMBER 2006

- ☒ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

- ☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?

<i>The project site is not located near a Fault Trace or Seismic Zone but it is in a Liquefaction Zone.</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?

<i>The project site is not located in a Landslide Zone.</i> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?

<i>The project site is not located in an area having high slope instability.</i> |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?

<i>The project site is located in a Liquefaction Zone.</i> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?

<i>The project is for a residential development.</i> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?

<i>The project site slopes less than 25%.</i> |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

_____ |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
The USGS quad sheet does not show a dashed line through the project area.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
The project site is not located near a FEMA Q3 Flood Zone.
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
The mudflow potential is low.
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from runoff?
The project is not in an area subject to high erosion.
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
Site drainage will be to the north via the private driveway with a proposed construction of a drop inlet to the existing county storm drain.
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

- ☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
The project site is not in a Severe Fire Hazard Zone.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
The project site is not in a Severe Fire Hazard Zone.
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? *The proposed project is for less than 75 dwelling units.*
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? _____
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
There are no known potentially dangerous fire hazard conditions or uses near the project site.
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
The proposed use is residential and is not considered a potentially dangerous fire hazard.
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8

☐ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
A railroad is located .18 miles northeast of the project site.
- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
Ethel D. Keenan Elementary School is located .08 miles southwest of the project site.
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?

- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
Construction noise.
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225—Chapter 35

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☒ Compatible Use

There are other residential uses buffering the proposed project from the railroad.

Grading and construction shall occur in compliance with Los Angeles County Noise Ordinance .

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
No wells are proposed for the site.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
The project site is served by the Sanitation District 15.
- ☐ ☐ ☐ If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Industrial Waste Permit ☐ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5
- ☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

- ☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?

<u>The project does not meet the criteria for regional significance.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?

<u>The project is for residential development.</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance.

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?

_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

<u>The construction of 5 residential units with an estimated grading of 500 cubic yards will not contribute substantially to any existing or projected air quality violation.</u> |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors: _____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☐ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?

<u>The project is not located within a SEA or ESHA.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?

<u>The project site is not covered with native species.</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?

<u>There is no major drainage course on the project site.</u> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?

<u>The project site is not covered with native species.</u> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?

<u>There are no oak or native trees located on the site.</u> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? _____

_____ |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Oak Tree Permit ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?

_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?

<u>The project site is not listed in the Historic Properties Inventory</u> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?

_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase I Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological**, **historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- The project site is not located in a mineral recovery zone.*
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
- The proposed project is consistent with the current land use.*
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

<u>The area is urbanized.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?

<i>The project is not located near a scenic highway.</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

<i>The project is not located near any trails.</i> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? <i>The project area is developed.</i> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?

_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?

_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): _____

_____ |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size
 ☐ Project Design
 ☐ Visual Report
 ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?

<i>The project is for less than 25 dwelling units.</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? <hr/> |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <hr/> | | | | |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130
- ☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

- ☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
The project will not contribute enough students to create capacity problems at the district level.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?
The project will not contribute enough students to create capacity problems at schools that serve the area.
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create student transportation problems?

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?

- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication ☒ Government Code Section 65995 ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?

The nearest fire station is located .15 miles away on Second Avenue. The project area is served by the City of Industry Sheriff's station located 2.66 miles away at 150 North Hudson Avenue.

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____
- _____
- _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Fire Mitigation Fees

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

The project site is located in the San Gabriel Water Company service area.

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?

- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☒ Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors? _____

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
<i>There are no visible tanks located on the project site.</i> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? _____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
<i>The site is not on a list of hazardous materials.</i> |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? _____ |
| i. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
_____ |
| j. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?

The land use for the project site is Low Density Residential (1-6 units per acre)

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

The property is zoned A-1-6000. All lots of the proposed project are greater than 5000 square feet.

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:

☐ ☒ ☐ Hillside Management Criteria?

☐ ☒ ☐ SEA Conformance Criteria?

☐ ☐ ☐ Other? _____

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project physically divide an established community?

- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
<i>The area is developed.</i>
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
<i>The project will increase the local housing stock.</i>
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population**, **housing**, **employment**, or **recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |
-

- | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
-

- | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
-

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact